REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 5 have been amended to correct typographical errors which the Examiner was kind enough to point out, claim 2 has been currently amended to further clarify the claim, claim 3 has been previously presented, claim 4 has been previously canceled, and claims 6-9 have been previously presented.

Independent Claim 1 and dependent claims 2-3 and 5-9 are now rejected under § 102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al (U. S. Patent 6,105,012 hereinafter "Chang"). In the prior Office Action, the claims were rejected under § 103(a) over Chang in view of Lincke et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,253,326)

The present invention relates to a new method for automatically operating a decryption function within a public web site page instead of the browser that has downloaded the web site page. Thus, as the title suggests, applicant provides self-decrypting web site pages which are not implemented in any prior art of which applicant is aware.

The Rejection of Claims 1-3 and 5-8 under § 102(e)

Claim 1

As is well known, under 35 USC § 102, anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in one prior art reference. And this is what the Examiner attempts to do on pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action in regard to Claim 1.

However, a careful study of Chang reveals that Chang does not disclose all of the elements of Claim 1. For instance, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Chang does not teach and describe **a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page**, as required by Claim 1.

In all of Chang's disclosures that are related to his decryption functions, he teaches and describes that his decryption functions reside in system elements other than his web site page, namely, in the server and browser as shown below. These items are discussed here because they completely contradict the Examiner's assertion.

(1) In Chang's Figure 15A where the logic diagram discloses the **web browser** receiving an HTML document **380**, he clearly discloses in the first decision box **382** that when an HTML document needs decryption, the **web browser** branches to **414** and **416** in Fig. 15B and **decrypts** the data in the document.

(2) In Chang's summary of the invention (Column 2 lines 29-32) he discloses "The **web browser** is also provided with the capability to generate random session keys, to **decrypt HTML forms**, and to . . ."

(3) In Chang (Column 4 lines 55-60) under **Web server procedures 120** Chang discloses an encryption procedure **126** for encrypting and **"decrypting data."**

(4) In Chang (Column 5 lines 23-27) he discloses "The **web browser 216** can contain the following: one or more user encryption keys **218** for randomly generating session keys; an encryption procedure for encrypting and **decrypting data**; . . ."

(5) In Chang (Column 9 lines 45-58) under **Financial Server Processing**, there are two instances where session keys **254** are **decrypted** and two instances where the decrypted session keys are used to **decrypt** form data **256**.

(6) In Chang (Columns 10 lines 45-47) he discloses: "Thus, **the web browser decrypts** the key from the known location . . ."

(7) In Chang (Columns 11 lines 1-2) he discloses: "**The server decrypts** and verifies the information in the received registration message."

(8) Chang's (Column 11 lines 34-48) states "The web browser **216** reads the data from the file until it reaches the corresponding FORM tag pair (i.e. </FORM>) (step **414**). **The web browser 216 decrypts** the form with the user's private key . . ."

Furthermore, Chang claims his decryption functions reside in his web browser and his server (Claims 16, 21, and 25), and does not claim that such a function resides in a web site page.

Other Elements of Claim 1 Not Disclosed in Chang

Besides not disclosing **a method for automatically operating a decryption function within a web site page,** as discussed above, Chang does not have the following elements that are listed below.

Chang in **(Column 4 lines 2-20)** does not disclose **providing the data within said web site page for validating an associated key for said cryptogram.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, the location of the data for validating keys, much less locating the data within the web site page. Chang merely infers that there is a decryption function somewhere in the web browser ("In certain cases, the HTML forms **124*a*** can be transmitted to the web browser **216** in an encrypted format . . .").

Chang in **(Column 3 line 66 – Column 4 line 11)** does not **provide a decryption function within said web site page which will automatically activate as said web site page is being displayed**. The reference does not disclose, in any context, the operation of a decryption or decrypting process within a web site page, so the web site page of Chang under any circumstance does not contain a decryption function that could automatically activate itself within the web site page.

Chang in **(Column 4 lines 2-20)** does not **provide a decryption function within said web site page which will execute within the confines of said web site page.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, the operation of a decryption or decrypting process within a web site page. This cited section of Chang merely infers that there is a decryption function somewhere in the web browser ("In certain cases, the HTML forms **124*a*** can be transmitted to the web browser **216** in an encrypted format . . .").

Chang in **(Column 2 lines 62-66 and Column 8 lines 60-66)** does not **provide a decryption function within said web site page which will receive and validate said associated key.** The references do not disclose, in any context, the receiving of keys associated with the cryptograms into the web site page, or even validating them. **(Column 2 lines 62-66)** of Chang refers to a user registration process which is not associated with any cryptograms in the web site pages. **(Column 8 lines 60-66)** relate to the verification of the client user by the financial server, and is completely unrelated to validating keys for cryptograms within website pages.

Chang in **(Column 8 lines 39-51)** does not **provide a decryption function within said web site page which will make available a decrypted version of said cryptogram.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, the generation of decrypted versions of cryptograms. This reference is in *The Web Browser Initialization Procedure* section of Chang's specification, and discloses only steps for obtaining the user's password and initializing the web browser, not the decryption of cryptograms.

Claim 1 is Not Anticipated by Chang

Because the above arguments clearly show that Chang teaches and describes that his web browser and server are the sole system elements in which his decryption functions reside, and because Chang's figures and specifications do not teach or describe that a decryption function or any of its elements reside within a web site page, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Chang, and requests reconsideration and allowance. Applicant has persuasively argued that Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Chang.

Claims 2-3 and 5 Rejections as Applied Above in Rejecting Claim 1

Since the method of Claim 1 is not anticipated by Chang, Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 2-3 and 5 as applied above in rejecting Claim 1.

Other References and Objections to Claims 2-3 and 5

The clarifying amendment to Claim 2, which requires that the **decryption function makes available a plurality of said decrypted versions within each said web site page in a plurality of said web site pages in a web site,** relates to the disclosure in Applicant's patent specification **(Page 12 lines 3-5)** which states that **". . . when cryptogram packages 111 in any page 100 are loaded . . ."** Also, see Applicant's **Figure 6** for support.

Dependent Claim 2 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang **(Column 2 lines 56-61; Column 8 lines 7-20 and Column 11 lines 16-54)** does not disclose **the availability of a plurality of said decrypted versions within each said web site page in a plurality of said web site pages in a web site, whereby all said decrypted versions are available for display in the original position of their corresponding said cryptograms within said web site,** as in amended Claim 2. Furthermore, the reference does not suggest, in any context, the availability of multiple decrypted versions (Chang's decrypted forms) within the same web site page.

Dependent Claim 3 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang **(Column 2 lines 56-61 and Column 9 lines 5-51)** does not disclose that a **cryptogram is of any size up to the size allowed by HTML standards for the body of said web site page**. Furthermore, the reference only discloses that Chang transmits his cryptograms as form data, and does not disclose the size limits of the form data relative to a web site page body. According to HTML standards, form data cannot be any size up to the size of a web site page body, as can the cryptograms in Applicant's invention.

Contrary to the Examiner's assertion in page 3 of the Office Action, Chang does not teach and describe **a method for providing a secure communication mechanism wherein the web page decrypts any document encrypted with confidential information.**

First – A web page is a document, and Chang, correctly, does not use the words "the web page decrypts any document" in **(Column 2 lines 56-61 and Column 9 lines 5-51)** cited by the Examiner on page 3 of the office action, nor does the Applicant use these words in any of his claims.

Second – The cited reference is contained in Chang's specification section titled *Financial Server Processing*, and discloses that the decryption is done by the Financial Server and not the web site page, as required in Claim 3.

Dependent Claim 5 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang **(Column 2 lines 2-33 and Column 9 lines 26-53)** does not disclose that a **decryption function obtains said associated key from a plurality of said associated keys, whereby each of said plurality of said web site pages contains within itself the means for independently decrypting a plurality of said cryptograms**, as in amended Claim 5. Furthermore, the reference only discloses that it is the web browser that has the capability to decrypt HTML forms (Chang's cryptograms), not a web site page.

Claim 6 Rejection as Applied Above in Rejecting Claim 5

Since the method of Claim 5 is not anticipated by Chang, Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claim 6 as applied above in rejecting Claim 5.

Other References and Objections to Claim 6

Dependent Claim 6 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang does not disclose that **a human operator provides said plurality of said associated keys, comprising:**

Chang **(Column 5 lines 43-44)** does not provide **a first means for sending an input request to said human operator**. The reference does not disclose, in any context, a means for the web site page to send an input request for cryptogram keys to the computer operator. It only discloses that the browser contains session keys for encrypting messages sent back to the server, thus is unrelated to operator entry of cryptogram keys into a web site page.

Chang **(Column 5 lines 23-30)** does not provide **a second means for receiving said plurality of said associated keys directly into said web site page.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, a means for receiving keys of any kind into a web site page. The reference only lists various contents and functions of the web browser, including the generation of keys that are used elsewhere in the system, but not received by the web site page.

Chang **(Column 5 lines 23-45 and Column 6 lines 57-64)** does not allow a human operator to determine **which of said plurality of said cryptograms are decrypted.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, that the client user determines which of several cryptograms will be decrypted, much less that a human operator can communicate directly with a web site page, as in Applicant's invention.

Claims 7 -9 Rejections as Applied Above in Rejecting Claim 6

Since the method of Claim 6 has not been anticipated by Chang, Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection of Claims 7 - 9 as applied above in rejecting Claim 6.

Other References and Objections to Claims 7 - 9

Dependent Claim 7 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang **(Column 11 lines 60 – Column 12 line 10)** does not disclose that a **human operator receives a validity report directly from said decryption function upon entry of each said associated key, whereby said human operator is afforded the convenience of receiving notice of the validity of each said key from said web site page itself.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, the exchange of information between a web site page and a human operator, nor does it disclose that a key validity notice emanates from a web site page. The reference discloses only the processes for the server/browser secure exchange of keys and messages.

Dependent Claim 8 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang does not disclose that **a plurality of associated keys are made available to said plurality of said web site pages in said web site, comprising:**

Chang **(Column 1 lines 66 – Column 2 line 10)** does not provide **a frameset page which will establish communication between said plurality of said web site pages if not already established.** The reference does not, in any context, disclose the use of a frameset page for any purpose, nor does it disclose any type of communication between web site pages. The reference only discloses that Chang's system exchanges web pages (containing HTML documents and forms) between the user's browser and the financial server in order to perform data transactions.

Chang **(Column 1 lines 46-50; Column 2 lines 30-55; Column 8 lines 40-46 and Column 11 lines 60 – Column 12 line 10)** does not provide **a third means which will distribute said plurality of said associated keys to all said web site pages as they are displayed**. The reference does not disclose the distribution of decryption keys among all the web site pages in a site, as in the Applicant's invention. The reference only summarily discusses the merits of digital certificates, discloses the generation of session keys that protect transactions, and discloses the method for initializing the web browser with a password.

Chang **(Column 2 lines 30-55; Column 5 lines 23-45 and Column 6 lines 57-64)** does not afford the human operator **the convenience of entering said plurality of said associated keys in a single declaration**. The reference does not disclose, in any context, that the user is afforded the opportunity to enter several or even one cryptogram key. The reference discloses only various unrelated web browser elements, functions, and data formats.

Dependent Claim 9 was rejected as anticipated by Chang. However, Chang **(Column 2 lines 56-66 and Column 8 line 60 – Column 9 line 3)** does not disclose the Applicant's method **wherein said decryption function operates only on the first instance of said cryptogram being found within said web site, whereby said human operator is requested to enter said plurality of said associated keys only if an instance of said web site page is encountered while said human operator is browsing said web site.** The reference does not disclose, in any context, a way to determine when the first cryptogram has been downloaded to the user, nor does it disclose a process that will allow the user to enter more than one key for decrypting the cryptograms within the user's requested data. The reference discloses only Chang's process wherein the user registers (logs-on) with the Financial Server to identify himself and his account. Furthermore, Chang (Column 2 lines 38-44) discloses that Chang's **web browser generates the keys** (session keys) that will be used by the server to encrypt the user's cryptograms before they are downloaded to the user.

Applicant submits that because each and every element of Claims 2-3 and 5-9 are not disclosed by Chang, anticipation is not possible. Applicant has pointed out that a number of elements in these claims are not found or even suggested by Chang.

It is respectfully submitted that the Applicant has successfully addressed the concerns raised by the Examiner and has shown that his invention is not anticipated by Chang. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would expedite matters, she is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

By Ralph V Bain, Applicant

Ralph Bain
39908 San Simeon Ct.
Fremont, CA 94539-3619
Tel.: (510) 657-6384